

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/710,776	11/09/2000	George J. Candella	FRA175/189535	5507
22206	7590 11/16/2006		EXAMINER	
FELLERS S	NIDER BLANKENSHIP	ELISCA, PIERRE E		
BAILEY & T	TIPPENS EDY BUILDING		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
321 SOUTH	BOSTON SUITE 800		3621	
TULSA, OK	74103-3318		DATE MAILED: 11/16/2006	5 ·

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

·· -· -· <u>·</u>		Application No.	Applicant(s)
		09/710,776	CANDELLA ET AL.
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit
	•	Pierre E. Elisca	3621
Pariod :	The MAILING DATE of this communication app for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address
	• •	VIO CET TO EVOIDE AL	AONTHAN OF THEFTY (ON PANCE
WH - Ex aft - If N - Fa An	HORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' ICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Dotensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 ar SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period value to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute by reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing med patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI e, cause the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed NTHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status			•
1)[\inf	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 A	uaust 2006.	
· <u> </u>		action is non-final.	
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowa	nce except for formal mat	ters, prosecution as to the merits is
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.[D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	•	•
· _	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are pending in the application		
1)(_	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw		
5)	Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
· · · · · · ·	Claim(s) <u>1-32</u> is/are rejected.		•
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Claim(s) is/are objected to.		
8)[Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.	
Annlica	tion Papers		
_	The specification is objected to by the Examine	ne '	•
	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acc		by the Evaminer
10)_	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	•	· ·
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •
11)[The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	-	• •
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	S 119(a)-(d) or (f)
)	priority and or or or or or	3 (4) (2) (1).
	1. Certified copies of the priority document	s have been received.	
	2. Certified copies of the priority document		Application No
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	rity documents have beer	received in this National Stage
	application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not	received.
			•
Attachme	nt(s)		
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413)
	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)		s)/Mail Date nformal Patent Application
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	• •

Application/Control Number: 09/710,776 Page 2

Art Unit: 3621

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to Applicant's amendment filed on 08/28/2006.

- 2. Claims 1-32 are pending.
- 3. The rejection to claims 1-32 under 35 U.S.C. 102 () as being anticipated by Walker et al U.S. Pat. No. 6,163,771 as set forth in the office action mailed on 04/25/2006 is maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by Walker et al U.S. Pat. No. 6,163,771.

Claims 1-32 have been rejected under the newly found prior Walker. Walker discloses a mail-order based credit card fraud, both Visa and MasterCard have deployed databases that allow a merchant to verify that a given credit card account number is connected to a

Application/Control Number: 09/710,776

Art Unit: 3621

specific billing address. Visa calls this service the Address verification service. The

Page 3

theory behind the service is that a thief (for example, a dishonest restaurant waiter)

might be able to use a credit card receipt slip to steal an active account number, but if

he tries to use that number for a mail order purchase he would not know the correct

address associated with that number. Even if a thief were to obtain the cardholder's

address, this service can allow a merchant to compare the shipping address of the

catalog order to the current billing address for that account number and thus possibly

identify any suspicious activity (which is readable as Applicant's claimed invention

wherein said a method for detecting fraud non-personal transactions), comprising the

steps of:

Collecting purchaser data for the transaction, said purchaser data comprising a billing

address and a ship-to-address; transmitting said ship-to-address to a fraud-detection

system, processing said ship-to-address to determine whether the transaction is

potentially fraudulent by checking the purchaser's ship-to-address against non-billing

address criteria, and returning the relative risk of fraudulent activity associated with the

transaction (see., col 2, lines 7-20).

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

6. Applicant's arguments filed on 08/28/2006 have been fully considered but they

are not persuasive.

REMARKS

Art Unit: 3621

- 7. In response to Applicant's arguments, Applicant argues that the prior art of record (Walker) fails to anticipate the cited claim limitation:
- a. Applicant's newly added limitation recites "checking the purchaser's ship-to address against non-billing address". Whereas, claim 6 recites ship-to address against the city and state with a Zip + 4 code. Therefore, the ship-to address criteria can be a billing address, a PO box address or any geographic area of the ship-to address.
- b. Applicant further argues that Applicant's method does not utilize the billing address as a criteria to be checked against the shipping address. And yet, Claims 4, 6, 20 and 21 recite the purchaser's ship-to address criteria comprises comparing the **city** and state of the ship-to address against the city and state with a **Zip + 4 code**. The city, the state, and the Zip + 4 code represent the person physical address, and can also be a billing address or a PO box address or an office address or a family member address. Accordingly, the specific billing address of Walker is the same as any regular address since they are used for the same purpose. Furthermore, an address is an address, it is just a label.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pierre E. Elisca whose telephone number is 571 272 6706. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Fischer can be reached on 571 272 6779. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 3621

Pierre Eddy Elisca

Primary Examiner

October 31, 2006